

AD-A109 786

D'APPOLONIA CONSULTING ENGINEERS INC PITTSBURGH PA F/6 13/13
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM. BEEBE LAKE DAM (INVENTORY NUMBER N--ETC(U)
SEP 81 L D ANDERSEN DACW51-81-C-0011


UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1-1
A
100786



END
DATE
FILMED
2 82
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

LEVEL

II

②


OSWEGO RIVER BASIN

INVENTORY NO. N.Y.394

DTIC
JAN 20 1982

E

black and white"



PREPARED FOR

NEW YORK DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS

AUGUST 1981

**APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED**

01 19 82 054

OTC FILE COPY

—

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	4D-A109786	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Phase I Inspection Report Beebe Lake Dam Oswego River Basin, Tompkins County, NY Inventory No. 394		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Phase I Inspection Report National Dam Safety Program
7. AUTHOR(s) LAWRENCE D. ANDERSEN		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc. 10 Duff Road Pittsburgh, PA 15235		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DACW51-81-C-0011
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Department of the Army 26 Federal Plaza New York District, CofE New York, New York 10287		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
13. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Department of the Army 26 Federal Plaza New York District, CofE New York, NY 10287		12. REPORT DATE 14 September 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		14. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; Distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Dam Safety National Dam Safety Program Visual Inspection Hydrology, Structural Stability Beebe Lake Dam Oswego River Basin Tompkins County		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report provides information and analysis on the physical condition of the dam as of the report date. Information and analysis are based on visual inspection of the dam by the performing organization. Based on the evaluation of the existing conditions, the condition of Beebe Lake Dam is considered to be good. The examination of documents and visual observations did not reveal conditions which constitute a hazard to human life or property. → not pay		

411001

The spillway capacity was evaluated according to the recommended procedure and it was found that the dam can probably pass the required spillway design floods of 50 percent to 100 percent of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) without significantly affecting the stability of the main dam, if the dam behaves as an arch structure. Therefore, the spillway capacity is rated as adequate.

Available documents, including a report by the owner, classifies the dam to be a gravity structure. Assuming behavior as a gravity structure, it was found that the factor of safety against overturning, even under normal pool loading conditions, is marginal. No design and construction information is available to document the precise geometry of the dam and whether it was constructed to function as an arch dam. Therefore, it is considered advisable that the owner undertake further investigations to evaluate the stability of the dam.

PREFACE

This report is prepared under guidance contained in the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, for Phase I Investigations. Copies of these guidelines may be obtained from the Office of Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314. The purpose of a Phase I Investigation is to identify expeditiously those dams which may pose hazards to human life or property. The assessment of the general condition of the dam is based upon available data and visual inspections. Detailed investigation and analyses involving topographic mapping, subsurface investigations, testing, and detailed computational evaluations are beyond the scope of a Phase I Investigation; however, the investigation is intended to identify any need for such studies.

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the dam is based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection along with data available to the inspection team. In cases where the reservoir was lowered or drained prior to inspection, such action, while improving the stability and safety of the dam, removes the normal load on the structure and may obscure certain conditions which might otherwise be detectable if inspected under the normal operating environment of the structure.

It is important to note that the condition of a dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam will continue to represent the condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through frequent inspections can unsafe conditions be detected and only through continued care and maintenance can these conditions be prevented or corrected.

Phase I inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the spillway design flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. Because of the magnitude and rarity of such a storm event, a finding that a spillway will not pass the test flood should not be interpreted as necessarily posing a highly inadequate condition. The test flood provides a measure of relative spillway capacity and serves as an aide in determining the need for more detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies, considering the size of the dam, its general condition and the downstream damage potential.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	<input type="checkbox"/>
By	
Organization/	
Activity Codes	
Institution/	
Special	
A	

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM
BEEBE LAKE DAM
N.Y. 394
DEC I.D. NO. 75A-691
OSWEGO RIVER BASIN
THOMPkins COUNTY, NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
ASSESSMENT	iv
OVERVIEW PHOTOGRAPH	vi
SECTION 1: PROJECT INFORMATION	1
1.1 GENERAL	1
1.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	1
1.3 PERTINENT DATA	3
SECTION 2: ENGINEERING DATA	4
2.1 DATA AVAILABLE	4
2.2 GEOLOGY	4
2.3 SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION	4
2.4 EMBANKMENT AND APPURTENANT STRUCTURES	5
2.5 CONSTRUCTION RECORDS	5
2.6 OPERATING RECORDS	5
2.7 EVALUATION OF DATA	5
SECTION 3: VISUAL INSPECTION	6
3.1 FINDINGS	6
3.2 EVALUATION	7
SECTION 4: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	8
4.1 PROCEDURES	8

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
4.2 MAINTENANCE OF THE DAM	8
4.3 WARNING SYSTEM IN EFFECT	8
4.4 EVALUATION	8
SECTION 5: HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGY	9
5.1 DRAINAGE AREA CHARACTERISTICS	9
5.2 ANALYSIS CRITERIA	9
5.3 SPILLWAY CAPACITY	9
5.4 RESERVOIR CAPACITY	9
5.5 FLOODS OF RECORD	9
5.6 OVERTOPPING POTENTIAL	9
5.7 EVALUATION	10
SECTION 6: STRUCTURAL STABILITY	11
6.1 EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY	11
SECTION 7: ASSESSMENT/RECOMMENDATIONS	13
7.1 ASSESSMENT	13
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	13
 <u>APPENDIX</u>	
A. PHOTOGRAPHS	
B. VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST	
C. ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST	
D. HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSES	
E. PLATES	
F. GEOLOGY MAP	

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

G. STABILITY ANALYSES

H. PREVIOUS INSPECTIONS/AVAILABLE DATA*

I. REFERENCES

*Not Included due to lack of pertinent data.

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

Name of Dam:	Beebe Lake Dam N.Y. 394
State Located:	New York
County Located:	Thompkins
Stream:	Fall Creek
Date of Inspection:	March 26, 1981 and June 3, 1981

ASSESSMENT

Based on the evaluation of the existing conditions, the condition of Beebe Lake Dam is considered to be good. The examination of documents and visual observations did not reveal conditions which constitute a hazard to human life or property.


The spillway capacity was evaluated according to the recommended procedure and it was found that the dam can probably pass the required spillway design floods of 50 percent to 100 percent of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) without significantly affecting the stability of the main dam, if the dam behaves as an arch structure. Therefore, the spillway capacity is rated as adequate.

Available documents, including a report by the owner, classifies the dam to be a gravity structure. Assuming behavior as a gravity structure, it was found that the factor of safety against overturning, even under normal pool loading conditions, is marginal. No design and construction information is available to document the precise geometry of the dam and whether it was constructed to function as an arch dam. Therefore, it is considered advisable that the owner undertake further investigations to evaluate the stability of the dam. An engineering investigation should be undertaken to evaluate in more detail the stability of the dam considering that if the dam behaves as a gravity structure, it does not appear to have adequate resistance to overturning.

The engineering investigation recommended above should commence within 3 to 6 months from final issuance of this report and any remedial work needed as a result of this investigation should be completed within 12 to 18 months from notification of owner. The recommendations below should be implemented within one year from final issuance of this report.

Assessment - Beebe Lake Dam

1. The downstream face of the dam should be inspected under a low flow or nonspill condition to more adequately assess the condition of the structure.
2. Continued periodic inspection of the dam by a professional engineer is recommended.



A handwritten signature of Lawrence D. Andersen in cursive script.

Lawrence D. Andersen, P.E.
Vice President
D'Appolonia Consulting Engineers, Inc.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Approved by:


A handwritten signature of Col. W. M. Smith, Jr. in cursive script.

Col. W. M. Smith, Jr.
New York District Engineer

Date:

14 Sept 81

BEEBE LAKE DAM
N.Y. 394
DEC I.D. 75A-691
MARCH 26, 1981



OVERVIEW

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM
BEEBE LAKE DAM
N.Y. 394
DEC I.D. NO. 75A-691
OSWEGO RIVER BASIN
THOMPkins COUNTY, NEW YORK

SECTION 1: PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 GENERAL

a. Authority

The Phase I Inspection reported herein was authorized by the Department of the Army, New York District, Corps of Engineers, to fulfill the requirements of the National Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367.

b. Purpose of Inspection

The inspection was to evaluate the existing conditions of the subject dam to identify deficiencies and hazardous conditions, determine if they constitute hazards to life and property, and recommend remedial measures where necessary.

1.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

a. Dam and Appurtenances

The Beebe Lake Dam is a concrete structure with a maximum height of 26 feet from the downstream toe. The dam consists of a central arch overflow section flanked by a nonoverflow section on the left (looking downstream) and secondary overflow sections on the right.

Very limited design and construction information is available for the dam. To the extent that can be determined from available information, the crest length of the main overflow section is about 145 feet. The two secondary overflow sections, with crest lengths of about 75 feet and 35 feet, are located to the right of the main overflow section. The crests of the secondary overflow sections are about six inches and two feet, respectively, above the crest of the main dam. The left nonoverflow section includes the intake facilities for an abandoned hydraulic laboratory facility below the dam. The abandoned facilities include a waterwheel immediately downstream of the dam and a penstock leading to the abandoned laboratory. Photograph 2 in Appendix A shows the facilities described above. Photograph 3 shows the intake house located at the right abutment of the dam for the hydroelectric facilities.

Available records indicate the typical cross section of the main dam to be approximately triangular, with a base width of 18 feet and structural height of 26 feet at the maximum section. The

downstream face of the dam is stepped, apparently to dissipate the energy of overflowing water. The records also indicate that the dam was constructed immediately downstream from an existing stone masonry dam which was left in place. The space between the new dam and the existing dam was filled with clay.

The two overflow sections of the dam constitute the spillway facilities. Other discharge facilities include a primary low level outlet incorporated into the main dam and a secondary low level outlet in the nonoverflow section. The main low level outlet facility is reported to be nonfunctional. The low level outlet in the nonoverflow section consists of a 48-inch-square sluice gate. The lake can be lowered by approximately 18 feet through this outlet.

b. Location

The dam is located on Fall Creek within the city limits of Ithaca in Thompsons County, New York. Plate 1 illustrates the location of the dam.

c. Size Classification

The dam is classified as small, based on the 26-foot height and normal pool storage capacity of 93 acre-feet.

d. Hazard Classification

The dam is classified to be in the high hazard category. Below the dam, Fall Creek flows through a narrow, deep gorge and enters the valley of Cayuga Lake, approximately one-half mile downstream from the dam. In the remaining 1.5-mile reach, the stream initially flows through residential areas and then discharges into Cayuga Lake. In this reach, the stream flows under State Route 34.

Based on visual observations, it is estimated that failure of the dam would cause loss of more than a few lives and appreciable property damage in the residential areas below the dam.

e. Ownership

The dam is owned and operated by Cornell University. (Address: Mr. Henry Doney, Director of Utilities, Humphrey Building, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, 607-256-4727).

f. Purpose of Dam

The purpose of the dam is water supply, recreation and hydropower.

g. Design and Construction History

The dam was designed by Cornell University in 1897, and construction was completed in 1900.

h. Normal Operating Procedure

The reservoir is normally maintained at or above the crest level of the overflow sections of the dam at Elevation 780.6 (USGS Datum).

1.3 PERTINENT DATA

Elevations referred to in this section and subsequent sections of the report were obtained from the available drawings of the dam.

a. <u>Drainage Area</u> (sq. mi.)	128.4
b. <u>Discharge at Dam</u> (cfs)	
Spillway at top of nonoverflow section	5700 \pm
Reservoir drain (sluice gate opening)	Unknown ⁽¹⁾
c. <u>Elevation (USGS Datum)</u> (feet)	
Top of dam (overflow section)	780.6
Top of dam (nonoverflow section)	784.7
d. <u>Reservoir</u> (acres)	
Surface area at top of overflow section	20
Surface area at top of nonoverflow section	22 \pm
e. <u>Storage Capacity</u> (acre-feet)	
Top of dam (overflow section)	93
Top of dam (nonoverflow section)	180 \pm
f. <u>Dam</u>	
Type	Concrete gravity/arch
Length	145 feet
Height	26 feet
Top width	6 \pm feet
Side slopes	Downstream: 1H:1.5V
	Upstream: Vertical
Cutoff	Unknown
Grout curtain	No
g. <u>Primary Spillway</u>	
Type	Three concrete overflow sections
Length (total)	225 feet
Crest elevations	780.6, 781 and 782.5 ⁽²⁾
h. <u>Reservoir Drain</u>	
Type	48-inch sluice gate
Length	Unknown
Access	Not accessible
Regulating facility	Electrically operated sluice gate hoist

⁽¹⁾Operable sluice gate discharges into the conduit located through the left abutment. No design information is available to determine the capacity of this low level outlet facility.

⁽²⁾See Plate 2 for layout of the overflow sections.

SECTION 2: ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 DATA AVAILABLE

Available information was obtained from New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Dam Safety Division files, and from the files of Cornell University. Available information includes limited drawings and past inspection reports and an emergency action plan for the dam.

2.2 GEOLOGY

The Beebe Lake Dam is located in the glaciated Allegheny Plateau section of the Appalachian Plateau Province. This region is characterized as a maturely dissected plateau with the topographic features modified by continental glaciation. The modification consists of rounding off of the high areas and deposition of glacial till in the valleys.

The dam site is located just north of a large northeast trending anticline (trending approximately north 70 degrees east). The folding is gentle with a maximum dip on the limbs of one to two degrees. The dip of the strata is affected locally by the folding; however, regionally, the rock strata dip south to southwest at approximately 100 to 150 feet per mile. The most prominent fracture orientations in the region have a strike of north 20 degrees west with a vertical dip. A secondary fracture trace strikes north 60 to 65 degrees east and is vertical, while less prominent fractures strike north 80 west and north 15 degrees east and are vertical. A prominent north 50 degrees east linear trends through the dam.

The rock strata in the area consist of unconsolidated Pleistocene glacial till (Wisconsin Drift) underlain by strata of the Genesee Group (Upper Devonian Age). The glacial till consists of a mixture of clay and silt with varying quantities of gravel. The glacial till is relatively thin on hilltops and slopes and thicker in the valleys. The bedrock consists of a thick sequence of interbedded gray to black shale, fissile black shale, brown-gray argillaceous limestone, gray siltstone occasionally calcereous, brownish-black petroliferous shale, brown sandstone, silty mudstone, and cross-laminated siltstone. In addition, there are several north-south trending kimberlite and alnoite dikes in the vicinity of the dam. These intrusions are Jurassic to Lower Cretaceous in age (approximately 145 to 150 million years old).

2.3 SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION

The available information includes no reference to a subsurface investigation.

2.4 EMBANKMENT AND APPURTENANT STRUCTURES

As noted before, very limited information is available on the design and construction of the dam. Sketches in Plate 2 illustrate the plan view and typical cross section of the main nonoverflow section as derived from the available information. As shown in Plate 2, the dam was constructed immediately downstream from an existing masonry dam and the space between the existing and the new dam was filled with clay. The main overflow section is approximately triangular in cross section, with a base width of 18 feet and a structural height of 26 feet at the maximum section. The downstream face was stepped, apparently for the purpose of dissipating the energy of falling water. References were found to indicate that a cutoff trench was excavated at the base of the main embankment. However, no reference was found to indicate the extent and nature of the cutoff trench.

The functioning low level outlet facility for the dam consists of a four-foot-square sluiceway located in the left abutment nonoverflow section. The flow through this outlet facility is controlled by a sluice gate located on the upstream face of the dam. The sluice gate is operated by a portable electric motor.

Available data include no reference to hydrologic, hydraulic, or stability analyses used to design the dam.

2.5 CONSTRUCTION RECORDS

No construction records are available. The available records indicate the dam is essentially the same as originally constructed and no major postconstruction changes were instituted.

2.6 OPERATING RECORDS

No operating records are maintained. Stream flow records are available from a USGS stream gaging station located approximately one-half mile upstream from the dam.

2.7 EVALUATION OF DATA

The information obtained from the state and Cornell University files is considered to be adequate for Phase I inspection purposes.

SECTION 3: VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 FINDINGS

a. General

Visual inspections of the dam were conducted on March 26 and June 3, 1981. On both dates, the pool level was approximately six inches above the crest of the overflow section.

b. Dam

No identifiable signs of distress or misalignment were observed. However, it should be noted that because the major portion of the dam is an overflow section and waterfalls are located immediately below the toe of dam, the dam could not be closely inspected. The dam was observed from vantage points approximately 100 to 150 feet from the dam along the abutments.

Some minor structural cracks were observed on the downstream side of the nonoverflow section near the left abutment. Plate 2 illustrates the locations of these observations. To the extent visible through falling water, horizontal crack-like features were observed on the downstream face of the main dam. It is possible that deteriorating concrete at horizontal construction joints could be causing this appearance. It is considered advisable that the downstream face of the dam be more closely inspected during low flow periods to assess the nature of these features.

c. Spillway

The dam constitutes the spillway of the dam.

d. Reservoir Drain

A four-foot-square sluiceway located on the left abutment nonoverflow section constitutes the main low level outlet facility for the dam. Flow through this sluiceway is controlled by a sluice gate located on the upstream face. The invert of the sluice gate is located approximately 18.5 feet below the overflow crest level. The sluice gate was operated by Cornell University personnel and observed to be functional.

e. Downstream Channel

The stream channel below the dam is a deep gorge. The channel appears to be stable in the near vicinity of the dam.

f. Reservoir

It appears that the reservoir is silted to within several feet of the spillway overflow section. There are sediment islands within the reservoir approximately 100 to 200 feet upstream from the dam. Cornell University personnel reported that plans are being considered to dredge the reservoir.

3.2 EVALUATION

The dam was found to be in good condition. However, as noted before, the dam can only be inspected from vantage points 100 to 150 feet away from the dam. A closer inspection of the downstream portion of the dam during low flow or nonspill conditions is considered to be advisable.

SECTION 4: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

4.1 PROCEDURES

The reservoir is normally maintained at the crest level of the dam with excess inflow discharging over the dam. The dam has no formal operating procedure.

4.2 MAINTENANCE OF THE DAM

The dam is maintained by Cornell University. The maintenance condition of the dam is considered to be satisfactory.

4.3 WARNING SYSTEM IN EFFECT

A formal emergency action plan, prepared at the request of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, defines the course of action to be followed by the operators of the dam in the event of an emergency and constitutes the warning system in effect.

4.4 EVALUATION

The maintenance condition of the dam is considered to be good. However, as mentioned previously, closer inspection of the downstream face of the dam during low flow conditions is considered to be advisable.

SECTION 5: HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGY

5.1 DRAINAGE AREA CHARACTERISTICS

Beebe Lake Dam has a watershed of 128.4 square miles. The stream falls approximately 1,000 feet from its headwaters about 10 miles northwest of Cortland, New York, to Beebe Lake at approximate Elevation 780. The watershed is predominantly covered with woodland and pastureland. Representative relief ranges between gentle to moderate.

5.2 ANALYSIS CRITERIA

As previously stated, Beebe Lake Dam is classified as a small dam in the high hazard category. Under the recommended criteria for evaluating emergency spillway discharge capacity, such impoundments are required to pass one-half to full PMF.

The PMF inflow hydrograph for the reservoir was determined using the Dam Safety Version of the HEC-1 computer program developed by the Hydrologic Engineering Center of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The data used for the computer input are presented in Appendix D.

5.3 SPILLWAY CAPACITY

The spillway facilities consist of the overflow sections of the dam. The discharge capacity of the overflow sections of the dam, without overtopping the left abutment nonoverflow section, is estimated to be about 5700 cfs. The spillway capacity was calculated assuming the overflow sections to be critical flow control sections.

5.4 RESERVOIR CAPACITY

The dam impounds a reservoir with a storage capacity of about 93 acre-feet at the spillway crest level and about 180 acre-feet at the nonoverflow crest level.

5.5 FLOODS OF RECORD

According to the USGS stream gage records, maximum flow in Fall Creek occurred on July 8, 1935, when the discharge was 15,500 cfs.

5.6 OVERTOPPING POTENTIAL

The PMF inflow hydrograph, determined according to the recommended procedure, was found to have a peak flow of about 76,000 cfs. The 50 percent PMF peak flow is 38,000 cfs. Various percentages of PMF inflow were routed through the reservoir and the dam was found to

pass less than 10 percent of the PMF without overtopping the nonoverflow section on the left abutment (Elevation 784.7). During the passage of 50 percent and 100 percent of the PMF, depths of flow over the spillway would be about 12 and 18 feet, respectively.

5.7 EVALUATION

The results of a preliminary stability analysis, which is discussed in Section 6, indicate that the dam would be stable during the passage of full PMF; therefore, the spillway capacity is classified to be adequate according to the recommended criteria. However, as discussed in Section 6, a detailed evaluation of the stability of the dam is advisable, considering that if the dam behaves as a gravity structure without arch action, it does not appear to have adequate resistance to overturning.

SECTION 6: STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY

a. Visual Observations

As discussed in Section 3, the field observations did not reveal signs of distress that would significantly affect the stability of the dam at this time. However, it was noted that the downstream face of the dam was obscured by falling water and the toe is not accessible for close inspection of the dam. Therefore, closer inspection of the dam under low flow or nonspill conditions was advised.

b. Design and Construction Data

Available information does not include any design calculations, design drawings or construction data to aid in the assessment of the structural stability of the dam.

c. Stability Analysis

In a report entitled Project No. 3251-NY Emergency Action Plan prepared by Cornell University, dated December 12, 1980, the dam is described to be a "monolithic concrete gravity dam." A preliminary stability analysis assuming the dam to be a gravity structure approximately triangular in cross section with a base width of 18 feet and structural height of 26 feet and using normal pool hydrostatic and silt loading, shows the dam to be only marginally stable. The following table summarizes the results of the preliminary stability analysis.

<u>Loading Condition</u>	<u>Location of Resultant from Toe</u>	<u>Sliding Factor of Safety</u>
Normal pool + silt loading	4.7 feet	Greater than 4
50 percent PMF	Outside of base	Less than 1 (by inspection)

Location of the middle one-third of the base is 6 to 12 feet from the downstream toe.

A further preliminary stability analysis, considering arch action in the main overflow section of the dam, is included in Appendix G. The results indicate that with consideration of arch action, the dam is likely to be stable under full PMF loading conditions. This arch analysis can only be considered as a first order approximation of the behavior of the dam because it is not clear that proper construction procedures and details were followed to attain an arch action. Also, no construction drawings are available to provide the precise geometry of the dam.

In view of the above concerns, it is considered advisable that the owner undertake further detailed investigations to evaluate the stability of the dam considering that if the dam behaves as a gravity structure, it does not appear to have adequate resistance to overturning.

d. Postconstruction Changes

No postconstruction changes are reported.

e. Seismic Stability

The dam is located in Seismic Zone 1. Based on the recommended criteria for evaluation of seismic stability of dams, the structure is presumed to present no hazard from earthquakes.

SECTION 7: ASSESSMENT/RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 ASSESSMENT

a. Safety

Visual observations indicate that Beebe Lake Dam is in good condition. No conditions were observed that would significantly affect the overall performance of the structure at this time. However, as previously noted, the main dam is an overflow section and falling water obscures the dam. Further, the toe of the dam is not accessible for closer inspection.

The spillway capacity was evaluated according to the recommended procedure and it was found that the dam can probably pass the required spillway design floods of 50 percent to 100 percent of the PMF without significantly affecting the stability of the main dam, if the dam behaves as an arch structure. Therefore, the spillway capacity is rated as adequate. However, available documents, including a report by the owner, classifies the dam to be a gravity structure. Assuming behavior as a gravity structure only, it was found that the factor of safety against overturning, even under normal pool loading conditions, is marginal. No design and construction information is available to document the precise geometry of the dam and whether it was constructed to function as an arch dam. Therefore, it is considered advisable that the owner undertake further investigations to evaluate the stability of the dam.

b. Adequacy of Information

Available information, in conjunction with visual observations, is considered to be sufficient to make a Phase I evaluation.

c. Need for Additional Investigations

Closer inspection of the downstream face of the dam during low flow or nonspill conditions is considered to be advisable. Also, an engineering investigation should be undertaken to evaluate in more detail the stability of the dam, considering that if the dam behaves as a gravity structure without arch action, it does not appear to have adequate resistance to overturning.

d. Urgency

The recommended engineering investigation should commence within 3 to 6 months from final issuance of this report and any remedial work needed as a result of this investigation should be completed within 12 to 18 months from notification of owner. The subsequent recommendations should be implemented within one year from final issuance of this report.

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. An engineering investigation should be undertaken to evaluate in more detail the stability of the dam considering that if the dam behaves as a gravity structure, it does not appear to have adequate resistance to overturning.

2. The downstream face of the dam should be inspected under a low flow or nonspill condition to more adequately assess the condition of the structure.
3. Continued periodic inspection of the dam by a professional engineer is recommended.


APPENDIX A
PHOTOGRAPHS



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 1
Dam (looking east)



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 2
Left Abutment (looking southeast)



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 3
Right Abutment (looking north)



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 4
Dam Crest



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 5
Left Abutment Low Level Outlet
Sluice Gate Hoist and Motor



PHOTOGRAPH NO. 6
Falls Creek Through Ithaca
(1.5 miles downstream)

APPENDIX B

VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST

APPENDIX B
VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST

1) Basic Data

a. General

Name of Dam Beebe Lake Dam

Fed. I.D. # N.Y. 394 DEC Dam No. 75A-691

River Basin Oswego

Location: Ithaca

Stream Name Falls Creek

Tributary of Cayuga Lake

Latitude (N) 42° 27.1' Longitude (W) 76° 28.8'

Type of Dam Concrete Arch/Gravity

Hazard Category High

Date(s) of Inspection March 26, 1981 and June 3, 1981

Weather Conditions Sunny, Temp. 40 degrees

Reservoir Level at Time of Inspection About six inches over
spillway crest Elevation 781 ±

d. Inspection Personnel Lawrence Andersen, P.E.; James Poellot,
P.E.; Bilgin Erel, P.E.; and Wah-Tak Chan, P.E.

c. Persons Contacted (Including Address & Phone No.) _____
Mr. Merrit E. Howtz, Associate Director of Plant Operations,
Department of Utilities, Cornell University, Ithaca, New
York 14853, (607) 256-4727

d. History:

Date Constructed 1897 Date(s) Reconstructed N/A

Designer Cornell University

Constructed by Unknown

Owner Cornell University

2) Embankment

a. Characteristics

(1) Embankment Material Concrete

(2) Cutoff Type Unknown

(3) Impervious Core N/A

(4) Internal Drainage System N/A

(5) Miscellaneous --

b. Crest

(1) Vertical Alignment N/A

(2) Horizontal Alignment N/A

(3) Surface Cracks N/A

(4) Miscellaneous N/A

c. Upstream Slope

(1) Slope (Estimate) N/A

(2) Undesirable Growth or Debris, Animal Burrows N/A

(3) Sloughing, Subsidence or Depressions N/A

(4) Slope Protection N/A

(5) Surface Cracks or Movement at Toe N/A

d. Downstream Slope

(1) Slope (Estimate) N/A

(2) Undesirable Growth or Debris, Animal Burrows N/A

(3) Sloughing, Subsidence or Depressions N/A

(4) Surface Cracks or Movement at Toe N/A

(5) Seepage N/A

(6) External Drainage System (Ditches, Trenches, Blanket)
N/A

(7) Condition Around Outlet Structure N/A

(8) Seepage Beyond Toe Unknown

e. Abutments - Embankment Contact

Not accessible for inspection.

(1) Erosion at Contact Unknown

(2) Seepage Along Contact Unknown

3) Drainage System

a. Description of System N/A

b. Condition of System N/A

c. Discharge from Drainage System N/A

4) Instrumentation (Monumentation/Surveys, Observation Wells, Weirs, Piezometers, etc.)

None

5) Reservoir

- a. Slopes Steep, no problems observed.
- b. Sedimentation Sediment appears to be within 5 to 6 feet of overflow crest.
- c. Unusual Conditions Which Affect Dam None

6) Area Downstream of Dam

- a. Downstream Hazard (No. of Homes, Highways, etc.) Residential area about 1.5 miles downstream.
- b. Seepage, Unusual Growth N/A
- c. Evidence of Movement Beyond Toe of Dam N/A
- d. Condition of Downstream Channel Deep gorge. Appears to be stable in the near vicinity of the dam.

7) Spillway(s) (Including Discharge Conveyance Channel)

- Overflow sections of the dam constitute the spillway facilities.
- a. General Main Overflow: Generally satisfactory (cannot be closely inspected).
- Auxiliary Spillway: N/A
- b. Condition of Service Spillway See note above.

c. Condition of Auxiliary Spillway N/A

d. Condition of Discharge Conveyance Channel N/A

8) Reservoir Drain/Outlet

Type: Pipe _____ Conduit _____ Other Sluice Opening
Material: Concrete X Metal _____ Other _____

Size: 46-inch x 46-inch Length Unknown

Invert Elevations: Entrance 760[±] Exit 740[±] (estimated)

Physical Condition (Describe): Submerged, not visible.

Material: Appears to be concrete.

Joints: N/A Alignment Unknown

Structural Integrity: Unknown

Hydraulic Capability: Unknown

Means of Control: Gate X Valve _____ Uncontrolled _____

Operation: Operable X Inoperable _____ Other _____

Present Condition (Describe): Operated by Cornell University
personnel, observed to be functional.

9) Structural

- a. Concrete Surfaces Visible surfaces are in satisfactory condition. Face of the dam cannot be closely inspected because of overflow.
- b. Structural Cracking Some minor cracking on the left non-overflow section. Horizontal looks like fractures on the face of the dam.
- c. Movement - Horizontal & Vertical Alignment (Settlement)
No preceivable misalignments.
- d. Junctions with Abutments or Embankments Dam abutment junctions not accessible for inspection.
- e. Drains - Foundation, Joint, Face The dam reportedly incorporates no drains.
- f. Water Passages, Conduits, Sluices Not accessible for inspection, submerged.
- g. Seepage or Leakage Cannot be identified. The entire dam is an overflow structure. Thus, water overflowing the dam precluded inspection.

- h. Joints - Construction, etc. Not visible.
- i. Foundation Not accessible for inspection.
- j. Abutments Not accessible for inspection.
- k. Control Gates Main dam level outlet sluice gate reported to be nonfunctional.
- l. Approach & Outlet Channels Approach channel: Beebe Lake is settled. There are sediment islands within 100 to 200 feet of the dam.
- m. Energy Dissipators (Plunge Pool, etc.) None
- n. Intake Structures None
- o. Stability No visually identifiable distress.
- p. Miscellaneous None

10) Appurtenant Structures (Power House, Lock, Gatehouse, Other)

a. Description and Condition There is an abandoned waterwheel downstream of the left abutment nonoverflow section.

PAGE B9 OF 9

APPENDIX C
ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST

APPENDIX C
ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST
NAME OF DAM: BEEBE LAKE DAM

AREA-CAPACITY DATA:

	<u>Elevation (feet)</u>	<u>Surface Area (acres)</u>	<u>Storage Capacity (acre-feet)</u>
1) Top of Dam	<u>784.6</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>180 [±]</u>
2) Design High Water (Max. Design Pool)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
3) Auxiliary Spillway Crest	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
4) Service Spillway Crest	<u>780.6</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>93</u>
5) Crest of Orifice (Normal Pool)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

DISCHARGES

	<u>Discharge (cfs)</u>
1) Average Daily	<u>180</u>
2) Spillway at Maximum High Water (Top of Dam)	<u>5700</u>
3) Spillway at Design High Water	<u>Unknown</u>
4) Principal Spillway at Dam Crest Elevation	<u>N/A</u>
5) Low Level Outlet	<u>300 [±] (estimated)</u>
6) Total of All Facilities at Maximum High Water (Top of Dam)	<u>6000</u>
7) Maximum Known Flood	<u>15,500</u>
8) At Time of Inspection	<u>200 [±]</u>

DAM: Beebe Lake Dam

CREST ELEVATION: 784.7

Type: Concrete Arch/Gravity

Width: 6 ± feet Length: 145 feet (main overflow)

Spillover: The dam is an overflow structure.

Location: Center of the dam.

SPILLWAY:

SERVICE		AUXILIARY
<u>780.6</u>	Elevation	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Concrete overflow</u>	Type	<u>N/A</u>
<u>145 feet (main overflow)</u>	Width	<u>N/A</u>
	<u>Type of Control</u>	
<u>Uncontrolled</u>	Uncontrolled	<u>N/A</u>
	Controlled	
<u>N/A</u>	Type (Flashboards; Gate)	<u>N/A</u>
<u>N/A</u>	Number	<u>N/A</u>
<u>N/A</u>	Size/Length	<u>N/A</u>
	Invert Material	<u>N/A</u>
	Anticipated Length of Operating Service	<u>N/A</u>
<u>N/A</u>	Chute Length	<u>N/A</u>
<u>5 to 6 feet</u>	Height Between Spillway Crest and Approach Channel Invert (Weir Flow)	<u>N/A</u>

Hydrometeorological Gages:

Type: USGS stream flow gage.

Location: One-half mile upstream of the dam.

Records:

Date - July 8, 1935

Max. Reading - 15,500 cfs

FLOODWATER CONTROL SYSTEM:

Warning System: None

Method of Controlled Releases (Mechanisms):

None

DRAINAGE AREA: 128.4 square miles

DRAINAGE BASIN RUNOFF CHARACTERISTICS:

Land Use - Type: Predominantly woodlands

Terrain - Relief: Moderate

Surface - Soil: Unknown

Runoff Potential (existing or planned extensive alterations to existing surface or subsurface conditions)

Drainage area is large. Development is not likely to
affect runoff in foreseeable future.

Potential Sedimentation Problem Areas (natural or man-made; present or future)

The lake is silted within 5 to 6 feet of the dam crest.

There are sediment islands within the lake.

Potential Backwater Problem Areas for Levels at Maximum Storage Capacity Including Surcharge Storage:

None

Dikes - Floodwalls (overflow and nonoverflow) - Low Reaches Along the Reservoir Perimeter:

Location: None

Elevation: N/A

Reservoir:

Length at Maximum Pool: 2,000⁺ feet

Length of Shoreline at Normal Pool: 5,000⁺ feet

APPENDIX D
HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSES

HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS
DATA BASE

NAME OF DAM: Beebe Lake Dam (NY DEC 75A-691)

PROBABLE MAXIMUM PRECIPITATION (PMP) = 21.0 INCHES/24 HOURS⁽¹⁾

STATION	1	2	3	4	5
Station Description	Beebe Lake	Beebe Lake Dam			
Drainage Area (square miles)	128.4	-			
Cumulative Drainage Area (square miles)	128.4	128.4			
Adjustment of PMF for Drainage Area (2)					
6 Hours	81	-			
12 Hours	95	-			
24 Hours	106	-			
48 Hours	112	-			
72 Hours	-	-			
Snyder Hydrograph Parameters					
C_p/C_t (2)	0.77/2.16	--			
L (miles) (3)	30.0	-			
L_{ca} (miles) (3)	17.7	-			
$t_p = C_t(L \cdot L_{ca})^{0.3}$ (hours)	14.11	-			
Spillway Data					
Crest Length (ft)	-	145.0			
Freeboard (ft)	-	4.0			
Discharge Coefficient	-	3.1			
Exponent	-	1.5			

(1) Hydrometeorological Report 33 (Figure 1), U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, 1956.

(2) Snyder's Coefficients.

(3) L = Length of longest water course from outlet to basin divide.

L_{ca} = Length of water course from outlet to point opposite the centroid of drainage area.

PEAK FLOW AND STORAGE (END OF PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS
 FLOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND (CUBIC METERS PER SECOND)
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES (SQUARE KILOMETERS)

OPERATION	STATION	AREA	PLAN	RATIOS APPLIED TO FLOWS								
				RATIO 1	RATIO 2	RATIO 3	RATIO 4	RATIO 5	RATIO 6	RATIO 7	RATIO 8	RATIO 9
				.07	.10	.20	.30	.40	.50	.60	.80	1.00
HYDROGRAPH AT	1	120.40	1	5316.	7595.	15189.	22784.	30379.	37973.	45568.	60758.	75947.
	(332.55)	(150.54)	215.06)	430.12)	645.17)	860.23)	1075.29)	1290.35)	1720.46)	2150.58)
ROUTED TO	2	120.40	1	5314.	7590.	15181.	22784.	30363.	37958.	45539.	60748.	75913.
	(332.55)	(150.47)	214.92)	429.88)	645.16)	859.79)	1074.85)	1289.52)	1720.18)	2149.61)

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS


PLAN 1	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE 780.60 0. 0.	SPILLWAY CREST 780.60 C. 0.	TOP OF DAM 784.70 85. 5750.	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW HOURS	CURATION OVER TOP HOURS	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM DEPTH OVER DAM	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR U.S.ELEV	RATIO OF PMF	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
					52.60	0.00	5314.	81.	0.00	784.51	.07	0.00
					52.60	10.00	7590.	100.	.69	785.39	.10	0.00
					52.60	20.00	15181.	151.	2.93	787.63	.20	0.00
					52.60	26.00	22784.	193.	4.75	789.45	.30	0.00
					52.60	28.00	30363.	232.	6.35	791.05	.40	0.00
					52.60	32.00	37958.	271.	7.84	792.54	.50	0.00
					52.60	34.00	45239.	310.	9.22	793.92	.60	0.00
					52.60	36.00	60748.	389.	11.75	796.45	.80	0.00
					52.60	40.00	75913.	470.	14.06	798.78	1.00	0.00

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By WTC Date 8/17/81 Subject Beebe Dam Sheet No. 1 of 1
 Chkd. By BE Date 8/28/81 SPILLWAY CAPACITY RATING Proj. No. 80-778

SPILLWAY RATING



SCALE:
 VERT. 1" = 4'
 Hori 1" = 100'

PRO FILE OF DAM AND SPILLWAY CREST
 (LOOKING D/S)

SPILLWAY CAPACITY

$$Q_s = \sum [CLH^{1.5}]$$


$$= (3.1) [(145)(W.L.EL-780.6)^{1.5} + (75)(W.L.EL 781.0)^{1.5} + (35)(W.L.EL 782.5)^{1.5}]$$

LAKE ELEVATION	Qs			COMBINED SPILLWAY CAPACITY	LAKE ELEVATION	Qs			COMBINED SPILLWAY CAPACITY
	L=145'	L=75'	L=35'			L=145'	L=75'	L=35'	
	cfs	cfs	cfs	cfs		cfs	cfs	cfs	cfs
780.6	0	—	—	0	785.0	4148.7	1860.0	428.9	6437.6
780.8	40.2	—	—	40.2	786.0	5640.5	2599.4	710.4	8950.4
781.0	113.7	0	—	113.7	787.0	7277.8	3417.0	1035.7	11730.6
781.5	383.8	32.2	—	466.0	788.0	9048.5	4306.0	1399.5	14754.0
782.0	744.6	232.5	—	977.1	789.0	10943.3	5260.9	1798.0	18002.2
782.5	1177.2	427.1	0	1604.4	790.0	12954.5	6277.5	2228.5	21460.6
783.0	1671.3	657.6	38.4	2367.2	792.0	17301.6	8482.3	3177.0	28960.9
783.5	2219.9	919.0	108.5	3247.4	794.0	22048.9	10897.8	4231.3	37178.0
784.0	2818.0	1208.1	199.3	4225.5	797.0	29853.5	14880.0	5990.8	50724.3
784.5	3462.0	1522.4	306.9	5291.3	800.0	38408.9	19255.4	7943.0	65607.3


APPENDIX E

PLATES

DRAWN BY: 7/22/81
 CHECKED BY: 7/22/81
 APPROVED BY: 7/22/81
 DRAWING 80-778-B35
 NUMBER 1-21-81



KEY PLAN



REFERENCES:

U.S.G.S. ITHACA WEST, N.Y. QUADRANGLE
 DATED: 1969, PHOTOREVISED: 1978, SCALE 1:24000
 U.S.G.S. ITHACA EAST, N.Y. QUADRANGLE
 DATED: 1969, PHOTOREVISED: 1978, SCALE 1:24000






PLATE I
BEEBE LAKE DAM
VICINITY FLOOD PLAIN & WATERSHED MAP

D'APPOLONIA

DRAWING 80-778-A8
 7/24/81
 7-24-81
 CHECKED BY [Signature]
 APPROVED BY [Signature]
 ACS
 7-14-81
 DRAWN BY [Signature]

NOTES

- (1) ELEVATIONS PER AVAILABLE DATA
- (2) APPROXIMATE ESTIMATED ELEVATION



SECTION A-A

NOT TO SCALE

PLATE 2


BEEBE LAKE DAM
 GENERAL PLAN
 FIELD INSPECTION NOTES
 FIELD INSPECTION DATE: MARCH 26, 1981

D'APOLONIA

APPENDIX F

GEOLOGY MAP

DRAWN BY
 CHECKED BY
 APPROVED BY
 4-29-81
 ACS
 JHP
 5/7/82
 DRAWING NUMBER 80-778-A3



GEOLOGY MAP

REFERENCE
 GEOLOGIC MAP OF NEW YORK, FINGER LAKES SHEET
 DATED 1970, SCALE 1:250,000

D'APPOLONIA

DRAWN BY ACS CHECKED BY S-7-81 DRAWING NUMBER 80-778-A6
 4-29-81 APPROVED BY JHP S-7-81

LEGEND

CANADAWAY GROUP 800-1200 ft. (240-370 m.)



Dcv Machias Formation—shale, siltstone; Rushford Sandstone; Caneadea, Canisteo, and Hume Shales; Canaseraga Sandstone; South Wales and Dunkirk Shales; In Pennsylvania: Towanda Formation—shale, sandstone.

JAVA GROUP 300-700 ft. (90-210 m.)



Dj Wiscoy Formation—sandstone, shale; Hanover and Pipe Creek Shales.

WEST FALLS GROUP 1100-1600 ft. (340-490 m.)




Dwn Nunda Formation—sandstone, shale.
 Dwg West Hill and Gardeau Formations—shale, siltstone; Roricks Glen Shale; upper Beers Hill Shale; Grimes Siltstone.
 Dwr lower Beers Hill Shale; Dunn Hill, Millport, and Moreland Shales.
 Dwc Nunda Formation—sandstone, shale; West Hill Formation—shale, siltstone; Corning Shale.
 Dwnm "New Milford" Formation—sandstone, shale.
 Dwrg Gardeau Formation—shale, siltstone; Roricks Glen Shale.
 Dwr Slide Mountain Formation—sandstone, shale, conglomerate.
 Dwm Beers Hill Shale; Grimes Siltstone; Dunn Hill, Millport, and Moreland Shales.

SONYEA GROUP 200-1000 ft. (60-300 m.)



Ds In west: Cashaqua and Middlesex Shales.
 In east: Rye Point Shale; Rock Stream ("Enfield") Siltstone; Pulteney, Sawmill Creek, Johns Creek, and Montour Shales.

GENESEE GROUP AND TULLY LIMESTONE 200-1000 ft. (60-300 m.)



Dg West River Shale; Genundewa Limestone; Penn Yan and Genesee Shales; all except Genesee replaced eastwardly by Ithaca Formation—shale, siltstone and Sherburne Siltstone.
 Dgo Oneonta Formation—shale, sandstone.
 Dgu Unadilla Formation—shale, siltstone.
 Dt Tully Limestone.

LOCKPORT GROUP 80-175 ft. (25-55 m.)



Sl Oak Orchard and Penfield Dolostones, both replaced eastwardly by Sconodoc Formation—limestone, dolostone.

GEOLOGY MAP LEGEND

REFERENCE

GEOLOGIC MAP OF NEW YORK, FINGER LAKES SHEET
 DATED: 1970, SCALE: 1:250,000


D'APPOLONIA

APPENDIX G
STABILITY ANALYSES

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By JAE Date 7/28/81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 1 of 2
 Chkd. By BE Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778



Per BE (7/28/81): From visual observations of the dam, silt exists to approximately 5' from the crest.

Typical values of the unit weight of loose silt

(J.E. Bowles, 1977, Physical & Geotechnical Properties of Soils, p. 5, McGraw-Hill) are

14.0-15.5 kN/m³ \approx 90-100 pcf, \rightarrow Assume $\gamma_{sat} = 100$ pcf.

$\rightarrow \gamma_{buoyant} = 100.0 - 62.4 = 37.6$ pcf.

$$U = 811.2 (18) \frac{1}{2} = 7300.8 \text{ lb/ft}$$

$$S = \gamma_s (210) (21) \frac{1}{2} = 8270.8 \text{ lb/ft}$$

$$P = (1622.4) (26) \frac{1}{2} = 21091.2 \text{ lb/ft}$$

$$W_1 = \frac{15}{2} (26) = 202.50$$

$$W_2 = 3.0 (26) = 78.00$$

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By J.E. Date 7/28/81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 2 of 2
Chkd. By PE Date 9/4/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

$$\uparrow \sum M_o = 10 W_1 + 16.5 W_2 - 12 U - 7.5 P - \frac{2^6}{3} P$$

$$= 10(29250) + 16.5(11700) - 12(7300.8) - 7(8290.8) - \frac{2^6}{3}(21091.2)$$

$$= 157,114 \text{ ft.-lb.} \rightarrow e = \frac{\sum M_o}{\sum V} = \frac{157,114}{(29250 + 11700 - 7300.8)} = 4.7 < 6.0$$

→ Resultant is outside middle $\frac{1}{3}$ portion of the base therefore, dam may be unstable.

• Check sliding stability

From Table 1, EM 1110-2-2200 (9/25/58), Loading Condition II

$$\sum H / \sum V \text{ (Max)} = 0.65$$

$$\rightarrow \sum H = P + S = 21091.2 + 8290.8 = 29382.0 \text{ lb}$$

$$\sum V = W_1 + W_2 - U = 29250 + 11700 - 7300.8 = 33649.2 \text{ lb}$$

$$\rightarrow \sum H / \sum V = \frac{29382.0}{33649.2} = 0.87 > 0.65$$

Foundation is composed of limestone, siltstone, and shale.

Typical lower bound strength parameters for these materials

are: limestone, $\phi = 56^\circ$, $c = 1100 \text{ psi}$; siltstone, $\phi = 57^\circ$, $c = 750 \text{ psi}$;

shale (Cucaracha shale) $\phi = 38^\circ$, $c = 45 \text{ psi}$ {From ETL 1110-2-184, 2-25-74}

$$(\tan \phi)_{\text{avg}} = (\tan 56^\circ + \tan 57^\circ + \tan 38^\circ) / 3 = 3.8\% / 3 = 1.27 \rightarrow \bar{\phi} = 51.7^\circ$$

$$\bar{c} = (1100 + 750 + 45) / 3 \approx 632 \text{ psi. } S_{\text{concrete}} = 2\sqrt{f'_c} \approx 110 \text{ psi (3000 psi concrete)}$$

$$S_{(S-A)} = \frac{f \sum V + 0.5(S) A}{\sum H} ; A = 18' \times 1' = 18 \text{ ft}^2, S = S_{\text{concrete}} = 110 \text{ psi.}$$

$$f = \tan \bar{\phi} = 1.27$$


$$\rightarrow S_{(S-A)} = \frac{1.27(33649.2) + 0.5(110)(18.0 \times 144 \text{ in}^2)}{29382.0} = \frac{185224}{29382} \approx 6.3 \geq 4.0$$

→ sliding is OK.

By DE Date 7-24-81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 1 of 8
 Chkd. By AE Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

ARCH DAM ANALYSIS

THE GEOMETRIC DATA SHOWN BELOW FOR THE MAIN OVERFLOW SECTION OF THE BEEBE DAM WAS SCALED FROM POST-CONSTRUCTION DRAWING OF THE DAM IS THEREFORE APPROXIMATE. THE DRAWINGS WERE OBTAINED FROM CORNELL UNIVERSITY FILES.



SCALE FROM DRAWINGS:-

$$L = 136'$$

$$f = 16'$$

$$\text{ARC LENGTH} = 145'$$

CALCULATE RADIUS:

$$R^2 = \left(\frac{L}{2}\right)^2 + (R-f)^2 = \frac{L^2}{4} + R^2 - 2Rf + f^2$$

$$R = \frac{1}{2f} \left(\frac{L^2}{4} + f^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2 \times 16} \left(\frac{136^2}{4} + 16^2 \right) = \underline{152.5' = R}$$

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By BE Date 7-24-81 Subject FREEZE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 2 of 8
 Chkd. By AS Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

ARCH ANGLE ϕ

$$\sin \phi = \frac{\frac{L}{2}}{R} = \frac{L}{2R} = \frac{136}{2 \times 152.5} = 0.446$$

$$\phi = \sin^{-1}(0.446) = 26.5^\circ = 0.46 \text{ RAD.}$$

BACK CALCULATE ARC LENGTH


$$\text{ARC LENGTH} = \frac{2\phi}{360} \cdot 2\pi R$$

$$= \frac{2 \times 26.5}{360} \cdot 2\pi \times 152.5$$

$$= 141 \text{ ft} \approx 145' \text{ SCALED LENGTH}$$


\therefore CALCULATED RADIUS & ϕ VALUES OK.

TYPICAL X-SECTION OF DAM & HYDROSTATIC LOADING:-





CHECK ARCH STRESS @ MID HEIGHT OF DAM



$$R = 152.5' = 1830''$$

$$H = \frac{\int \overbrace{M_x' y}^A \frac{ds}{EI} - \int \overbrace{P_z'}^B \frac{dz}{EA}}{\int \underbrace{y^2}_{C} \frac{ds}{EI} - \int \underbrace{\left(\frac{dz}{ds}\right) dz}_{D} / EA}$$

REF (1)

WHERE

$$A = \frac{qR^4}{I} \left(\frac{2}{3} \sin^3 \phi_0 - \phi_0 \cos \phi \sin^2 \phi + \frac{1}{2} \phi_0 \cos \phi_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sin \phi \cos^2 \phi_0 \right)$$

$$B = \frac{2qR^2}{3A} (\sin^3 \phi)$$

GS OF 10

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By PE Date 7-24-81 Subject BEERE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 4 of 8
 Chkd. By J.E. Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

$$C = \frac{R^3}{I} (\phi_0 + 2\phi_0 \cos^2 \phi_0 - 3 \sin \phi_0 \cos \phi_0) \left(\frac{1}{in}\right)$$

$$D = \frac{R}{A} (\phi_0 + \sin \phi \cos \phi) \left(\frac{1}{in}\right)$$

FROM PG 1 $\phi_0 = 26.5^\circ = 0.463 \text{ rad.}$

$\therefore \sin \phi_0 = 0.446$ $(R = 1830")$
 $\cos \phi_0 = 0.895$

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{q(1830)^4}{3 \times 10^6} \left(\frac{2}{3} \frac{(0.446)^3}{0.059} - \frac{0.463 \times 0.895 \times (0.446)^2}{0.082} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{0.463 \times 0.895}{0.207} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \frac{0.446 \times 0.895}{0.179} \right) \\ &= 3.74 \times 10^6 (0.059 - 0.082 + 0.207 - 0.179) = 1.87 \times 10^4 q \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \frac{2 \times 1830^2}{3 \times 1728} q (0.446^3) = \frac{1.14 \times 10^2 q}{0.001 \times 10^4 q} \\ &= 0.001 \times 10^4 q \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \frac{1830^3}{3 \times 10^6} (0.463 + 2 \frac{0.463 \times 0.895}{0.742} - 3 \frac{0.446 \times 0.895}{1.198}) \\ &= 2.04 \times 10^3 (0.463 + 0.742 - 1.198) = 14.30 q \end{aligned}$$

$$D = \frac{1830}{1728} (0.463 + \frac{0.446 \times 0.895}{0.399}) = 0.91 q$$

$$\therefore H = \frac{1.87 \times 10^4 - 0.001 \times 10^4}{14.30 - 0.91} q = \underline{\underline{1397 q (in)}}$$

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By BE Date 7/24/81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 5 of 8
 Chkd. By 12 Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

FROM HEC-1 COMPUTER PROGRAM OUTPUT OVERTOPPING
 DEPTH @ 100 % PMF IS ≈ 17 FT (SEE APPENDIX D)

\therefore HYDROSTATIC PRESSURE @ MID HEIGHT OF DAM


$$p = \gamma_w \left(17 + \frac{26}{2} \right) = 1872 \text{ psf} \quad \gamma_w = 62.4 \text{ lb/ft}^3$$

$$\text{LOADING PER INCH ARC LENGTH} = \frac{1872}{12} = 156 \text{ lbs/in}$$


$$H = 1397 \text{ ft} \cdot 156 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{ft}} \approx \underline{\underline{218 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs}}}$$

$$V = \frac{qL}{2} = \frac{1872 \times 136'}{2} = 127 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs}$$

$$\text{RESULTANT} \quad R = \sqrt{H^2 + V^2} = 252 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs.}$$



$$\theta = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{127}{252} \right) = 30.3^\circ$$



$$\text{SHEAR} = R \cos 57^\circ = 138 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs}$$

$$\text{NORMAL} = R \sin 57^\circ = 211 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs}$$

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By BE Date 7/24/81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 6 of 8
kd. By A.E. Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATION 5 Proj. No. 30-778

CHECK ABUTMENT STRESSES UNDER 100% PMF LOADING

$$\text{SHEAR} = \frac{138 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs}}{1728 \text{ in}^2} = 80 \text{ psi.}$$

$$\text{COMPRESSION} = \frac{211 \times 10^3}{1728 \text{ in}^2} = 122 \text{ psi.}$$

VISUAL OBSERVATIONS AT THE SITE INDICATE THAT
FOUNDATION ROCKS ARE SAND & LIMESTONES

ACCORDING TO ETL 1110-2-184 Feb 25, 1974 AVERAGE
LOWER BOUND SHEAR STRENGTH OF CALCAREOUS &
SEDIMENTARY ROCKS ARE :-

CALCAREOUS : $\phi : 45^\circ$ S: SHEAR STRENGTH = 500 psi

SEDIMENTARY : $\phi : 47^\circ$ S: " " = 500 psi
(EXCEPT GRAVELS)

FACTOR OF SAFETY AGAINST ABUTMENT SLIDING :

SAT $\phi = 45^\circ$ S = 500 psi

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \Sigma V \tan \phi + S A \\ &= 213 \times 10^3 \tan 45^\circ + 500 \times 1728 \\ &= 233 \times 10^3 + 864 \times 10^3 \text{ lbs.} = 1075 \times 10^3 \end{aligned}$$

$$S.F. = \frac{R}{\text{SHEAR FORCE}} = \frac{1075 \times 10^3}{138 \times 10^3} = 7.8 > 4 \text{ OK}$$

COMPRESSION 135 psi OK BY INSPECTION.

D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By BE Date 7-24-81 Subject REEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 7 of 8
Chkd. By ME Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS. Proj. No. 80-778

CHECK MID SPAN STRESSES:

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \frac{qL^2}{8} - Hf \quad f = 16' \\ &= \frac{156 \text{ lb/in} \times 136 \times 12^2}{8} - 218 \times 10^3 \times 16 \times 12 \\ &= 51.9 \times 10^6 - 41.8 \times 10^6 \text{ in-lb} \\ &= 10.2 \times 10^6 \text{ in-lb} \end{aligned}$$

$$\sigma = \frac{H}{A} \pm \frac{M}{S} \quad S = \frac{bh^2}{6}$$

$$b = 12" \quad h = 144" \quad S = 41.5 \times 10^3 \text{ in}^3$$

$$\sigma = \frac{218,000}{1728} \pm \frac{10.2 \times 10^6}{41.5 \times 10^3} = 126 \pm 243$$

$$\text{TENSION} = 117 \text{ psi} \quad \text{COMPRESSION} = 369 \text{ psi}$$

ASSUMING DAM CONCRETE TO BE $f_c' = 3000 \text{ psi}$.

ULTIMATE TENSILE STRENGTH: $f_r = 7.5 \sqrt{f_c'}$ ACI-318-71
9.5.2.2

$$f_r = 410 \text{ psi} > 117 \text{ psi} \therefore \text{OK}$$


D'APPOLONIA

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

By BE Date 7-24-81 Subject BEEBE LAKE DAM Sheet No. 8 of 8
 Chkd. By M.E. Date 8/5/81 STABILITY CALCULATIONS Proj. No. 80-778

CHECK STABILITY ASSUMING THE DAM TO BE
A GRAVITY STRUCTURE

LOADING : 50 % PMF OVERTOPPING : 11 ft.



MOMENTS ABOUT PT 'O'

$$\begin{aligned}
 M &= 15 W_1 + 8 W_2 - 12 U - 13 R_1 - \frac{26}{3} R_2 \\
 &= (351 + 187 - 117 - 232 - 183) \times 10^3 \text{ ft-lbs} \\
 &= (538 - 532) \times 10^3 = 6 \times 10^3 \text{ lb-ft.}
 \end{aligned}$$

BY INSPECTION THE RESULTANT OF THE FORCES FALLS OUT OF THE MIDDLE $\frac{1}{3}$ OF THE BASE \therefore THE DAM MAY BE UNSTABLE.

APPENDIX I

REFERENCES

APPENDIX I

REFERENCES

Broughton, J. G., D. W. Fisher, Y. W. Isachsen, and L. V. Rickard, 1966, "Geology of New York," New York State Museum and Science Service, Educational Leaflet 20, 50 pp.

Fisher, D. W., Y. W. Isachsen, and L. V. Rickard, 1971, "Generalized Tectonic-Metamorphic Map of New York," New York Museum and Science Service, Map and Chart Series No. 15.

Flint, R. F., 1971, Glacial and Quaternary Geology, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 892 pp.

Rickard, L. V. and D. W. Fisher, 1970, "Geologic Map of New York, Finger Lakes Sheet," New York State Museum and Science Service, Map and Chart Series No. 15.

Thornburg, W. D., 1965, Regional Geomorphology of the United States, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 609 pp.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1956, Hydrometeorological Report No. 33.

U.S. Department of Commerce, 1965, Weather Bureau Hydrometeorological Report No. 40.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1974, Design of Small Dams.

Wright, H. E., Jr. and D. G. Frey, 1965, The Quaternary of the United States, Princeton University Press, 922 pp.